

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

## PCT

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

### WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing  
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference  
see form PCT/ISA/220

**FOR FURTHER ACTION**  
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.  
PCT/IL2008/001292

International filing date (day/month/year)  
24.09.2008

Priority date (day/month/year)  
01.10.2007

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC  
INV. A61F2/00

Applicant  
CONTIPI LTD.

**1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:**

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☒ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☒ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☒ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

**2. FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

**3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.**

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office  
D-80298 Munich  
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0  
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Date of completion of  
this opinion

see form  
PCT/ISA/210

Authorized Officer

Serra i Verdaguer, J  
Telephone No. +49 89 2399-8198



**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.  
PCT/IL2008/001292

---

**Box No. I Basis of the opinion**

---

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
  - ☒ the international application in the language in which it was filed
  - ☐ a translation of the international application into , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (Rules 12.3(a) and 23.1 (b)).
2. ☐ This opinion has been established taking into account the **rectification of an obvious mistake** authorized by or notified to this Authority under Rule 91 (Rule 43bis.1(a))
3. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
  - a. type of material:
    - ☐ a sequence listing
    - ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
  - b. format of material:
    - ☐ on paper
    - ☐ in electronic form
  - c. time of filing/furnishing:
    - ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
    - ☐ filed together with the international application in electronic form.
    - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
4. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
5. Additional comments:

**Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability**

The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of

☐ the entire international application

☒ claims Nos. 30-41

because:

☒ the said international application, or the said claims Nos. 30-36 relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international search (*specify*):

see separate sheet

☐ the description, claims or drawings (*indicate particular elements below*) or said claims Nos. are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):

☐ the claims, or said claims Nos. are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):

☒ no international search report has been established for the whole application or for said claims Nos. 30-41

☐ a meaningful opinion could not be formed without the sequence listing; the applicant did not, within the prescribed time limit:

☐ furnish a sequence listing on paper complying with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions, and such listing was not available to the International Searching Authority in a form and manner acceptable to it.

☐ furnish a sequence listing in electronic form complying with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions, and such listing was not available to the International Searching Authority in a form and manner acceptable to it.

☐ pay the required late furnishing fee for the furnishing of a sequence listing in response to an invitation under Rules 13~~ter~~.1(a) or (b).

☐ a meaningful opinion could not be formed without the tables related to the sequence listings; the applicant did not, within the prescribed time limit, furnish such tables in electronic form complying with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-*bis* of the Administrative Instructions, and such tables were not available to the International Searching Authority in a form and manner acceptable to it.

☐ the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in electronic form only, do not comply with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-*bis* of the Administrative Instructions.

☐ See Supplemental Box for further details

---

**Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention**

---

1. ☒ In response to the invitation (Form PCT/ISA/206) to pay additional fees, the applicant has, within the applicable time limit:
- ☐ paid additional fees
  - ☐ paid additional fees under protest and, where applicable, the protest fee
  - ☐ paid additional fees under protest but the applicable protest fee was not paid
  - ☒ not paid additional fees
2. ☐ This Authority found that the requirement of unity of invention is not complied with and chose not to invite the applicant to pay additional fees.
3. This Authority considers that the requirement of unity of invention in accordance with Rule 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3 is
- ☐ complied with
  - ☒ not complied with for the following reasons:  
**see separate sheet**
4. Consequently, this report has been established in respect of the following parts of the international application:
- ☐ all parts.
  - ☒ the parts relating to claims Nos. 1-29

---

**Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

---

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	<u>12,13,17,19,29</u>
	No: Claims	<u>1-11,14-16,18,20-28</u>
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	<u>12,13,17,19,29</u>
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	<u>1-29</u>
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

**see separate sheet**

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.  
PCT/IL2008/001292

---

**Box No. VI    Certain documents cited**

---

1. Certain published documents (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 70.10)  
and /or
2. Non-written disclosures (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 70.9)  
see form 210

**Re Item III**

**Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability**

The subject-matter of claim 30 to 36, discloses a method of ameliorating urinary incontinence. The method comprises the step of intra-vaginally inserting the apparatus. The International preliminary searching authority is not required to establish an opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability on methods for treatment of the human body by surgery or therapy (Rule 39.1(iv)).

**Re Item IV**

**Lack of unity of invention**

This Authority considers that there are 3 inventions covered by the claims indicated as follows:

- I: Claims 1-29 directed to an apparatus for treating urinary incontinence comprising an extension and conversion mechanism
- II: Claims 37, 38 directed to an apparatus for treating urinary incontinence compressing legs and arms not axially aligned
- III: Claims 39-41 directed to an apparatus for treating urinary incontinence comprising legs and arms adapted to be connected

The reasons for which the inventions are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept, as required by Rule 13.1 PCT, are as follows:

The common features linking together the above groups of claims are: an anchor section comprising a anchor legs, and a support section comprising support arms.

The prior art has been identified as document WO-A-2006/097935 and discloses all these features. Therefore the common features linking together the above groups of claims are not novel. Moreover, there is no common inventive concept linking together the above groups of claims. Claim 1 provides device that can be easily extended and compressed. Claim 37 provides a device that fits better into the body and claim 39 provides a device whereby the arms and legs can be connected.

In conclusion, the groups of claims are not linked by common or corresponding special

technical features and define 3 different inventions not linked by a single general inventive concept.

The application, hence does not meet the requirements of unity of invention as defined in Rules 13.1 and 13.2 PCT.

**Re Item V**

**Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

1. Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: WO 2008/010214 A (CONTIPI LTD [IL]; ZIV ELAN [IL]; GILAN JACOB [IL]; SINAI NIR [IL]; BAU) 24 January 2008 (2008-01-24)  
D2: WO 2006/097935 A (CONTIPI LTD [IL]; SINAI NIR [IL]; ZIV ELAN [IL]; BUDER IDAN [IL]; GILA) 21 September 2006 (2006-09-21)  
D3: WO 2005/087154 A (CONTIPI LTD [IL]; ZIV ELAN [IL]) 22 September 2005 (2005-09-22)

2. The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claim 1 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.

The document D2 discloses (pages 17 to 20 and figures): an apparatus for treating urinary incontinence, comprising: a support section (114) adapted for providing at least one of urethral support and pressure against a portion of the urethra; an anchoring section (106) adapted for resisting movement of said apparatus; a normally open expansion (118) mechanism adapted to urge said support section radially outwards; and a conversion mechanism (116) adapted to sharply and selectively reduce an outward urging of said support section.

3. Dependent claims 2 to 29 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty or inventive step, see documents D2 and D3 and the corresponding passages cited in the search report.

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING  
AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)**

International application No.

PCT/IL2008/001292

**Re Item VI**

**Certain documents cited**

Certain published documents (Rule 70.10)

Application No Patent No	Publication date (day/month/year)	Filing date (day/month/year)	Priority date ( <i>valid claim</i> ) (day/month/year)
WO-A-2008/010214	24.01.2008	16.07.2007	16.07.2006

Although Document D1 does constitute prior art within the meaning of Rule 64.1(b) PCT it appears to disclose all the features of the claims.

No check has been made as to whether the priority of this prior application has been validly claimed.



Possible steps after receipt of the international search report (ISR) and written opinion of the International Searching Authority (WO-ISA)

---

General information

For all international applications filed on or after 01/01/2004 the competent ISA will establish an ISR. It is accompanied by the WO-ISA. Unlike the former written opinion of the IPEA (Rule 66.2 PCT), the WO-ISA is not meant to be responded to, but to be taken into consideration for further procedural steps. This document explains about the possibilities.

---

Amending claims under Art. 19 PCT

Within 2 months after the date of mailing of the ISR and the WO-ISA the applicant may file amended claims under Art. 19 PCT directly with the International Bureau of WIPO. The PCT reform of 2004 did not change this procedure. For further information please see Rule 46 PCT as well as form PCT/ISA/220 and the corresponding Notes to form PCT/ISA/220.

---

Filing a demand for international preliminary examination

In principle, the WO-ISA will be considered as the written opinion of the IPEA. This should, in many cases, make it unnecessary to file a demand for international preliminary examination. If the applicant nevertheless wishes to file a demand this must be done before expiry of 3 months after the date of mailing of the ISR/ WO-ISA or 22 months after priority date, whichever expires later (Rule 54bis PCT). Amendments under Art. 34 PCT can be filed with the IPEA as before, normally at the same time as filing the demand (Rule 66.1 (b) PCT).

If a demand for international preliminary examination is filed and no comments/amendments have been received the WO-ISA will be transformed by the IPEA into an IPRP (International Preliminary Report on Patentability) which would merely reflect the content of the WO-ISA. The demand can still be withdrawn (Art. 37 PCT).

---

Filing informal comments

After receipt of the ISR/WO-ISA the applicant may file informal comments on the WO-ISA directly with the International Bureau of WIPO. These will be communicated to the designated Offices together with the IPRP (International Preliminary Report on Patentability) at 30 months from the priority date. Please also refer to the next box.

---

End of the international phase

At the end of the international phase the International Bureau of WIPO will transform the WO-ISA or, if a demand was filed, the written opinion of the IPEA into the IPRP, which will then be transmitted together with possible informal comments to the designated Offices. The IPRP replaces the former IPER (international preliminary examination report).

---

Relevant PCT Rules and more information

Rule 43 PCT, Rule 43bis PCT, Rule 44 PCT, Rule 44bis PCT, PCT Newsletter 12/2003, OJ 11/2003, OJ 12/2003